

contradoping only a first region of the source which directly contacts the conduction channel to make the first transistor degenerate.

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed August 12, 1999, and in lieu of filing an Appeal Brief, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application claim 10 has been amended. Thus, by the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 3-12 remain in this application. The claims as presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 10 has been amended merely to correct a typographical error and entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 3-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Miller (EP 0213983). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The following discussion explains how each of the independent claims are patentable over Miller.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a **method** for programming a read-only memory cell including a transistor formed in a semiconductor substrate of a first doping type, the transistor having a drain and a source of a second doping type separated in the substrate by a conduction channel. The method includes a step of contradoping a first region of the source such that the first region is of the first doping type to prevent a transistor effect from occurring, the first region directly contacting the conduction channel. The step of contradoping includes a step of contradoping only the first region of the source of the transistor such that a second region of the source remains of the second doping type.

The Examiner stated that "[t]he process of how the first region is made has no patentable weight in claim drawn to a structure." Based on this statement, the Examiner stated that the term contradoping in claim 1 was non-limiting and did not deal with the step of contradoping at all in the Office Action.